

Appl. No. 10/594,140
Election dated Nov. 24, 2008
Reply to Restriction Requirement of Oct. 28, 2008
Attorney Docket No. 1455-062823

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 10/594,140 Confirmation No. 7077
Applicants : Seong-Ho HAN et al.
Filed : September 25, 2006
Title : Cold Rolled Steel Sheet and Hot Dipped Steel Sheet With
Superior Strength and Bake Hardenability and Method for
Manufacturing the Steel Sheets
Art Unit : 1793
Examiner : Mark L. Shevin
Customer No. : 28289

ELECTION WITH TRAVERSE

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated October 28, 2008, in which a shortened statutory period for reply was set for one month. The Examiner required restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121 as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-44, drawn to steel sheet products; and

Group II: Claims 45-52, drawn to methods of making steel sheets.

Applicants provisionally elect for further prosecution the invention of Group I including claims 1-44.

Applicants reserve their right to file at a later time a divisional application directed to the non-elected claims.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date set forth below.

Diane Paull

(Name of Person Mailing Paper)

Signature

11/24/2008
Date

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.48(b), there is no change in inventorship as a result of this election.

Applicants respectfully traverse this restriction requirement as indicated hereinafter.


The Examiner asserts that the inventions do not relate to a single general inventive concept because they lack the same or corresponding claimed technical features. The question of unity of invention has been reconsidered retroactively by the Examiner in view of JP 10-130733 to Tosaka.

The Examiner states that Tosaka demonstrates that the technical feature as to composition does not define over the prior art. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the prior art of record supports restriction of the claimed subject matter to the groups mentioned above.

It should be noted that in the comparative chart appearing on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner has not set forth the Nb/C ratio of 0.3-0.7 as it appears in the present claims. We further see that in JP '733, Table 1, the only alloys containing Nb, namely, alloy Nos. 1, 6, and 8, have Nb/C ratios of 2.67; 5.0; and 1.2, respectively. None of the alloys of JP '733 satisfy this Nb/C ratio claim requirement. Clearly, Tosaka does not teach or suggest this critical claim limitation. The Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested along with examination of claims 1-52.

Respectfully submitted,
THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By


Kent E. Baldauf
Registration No. 25,826
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094